

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated August 11, 2008. Claims 1 to 25 are currently pending. Claims 1, 10, and 21 are in independent form. No claims are being amended in this response. Please charge deposit account number 02-1818 for any fees due in association with this Response.

The Office Action rejected independent Claims 1, 10, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rowe* (U.S. Patent 6,892,182) in view of *Foodman* (U.S. Patent 6,547,131). Applicants disagree and traverse this rejection.

Each of the pending claims recites a kiosk based system or method (such as an automated teller machine) that enables a player to move money from a remote fund repository (such as a bank) via an electronic fund transfer network (such as a banking network) into a gaming device (such as a slot machine). The funds are moved from the kiosk to the gaming device via a printed ticket that is approved by a ticket validation system (such as a local casino server) via a ticket validation network (such as a local casino network). The kiosk is connected to and communicates through an electronic fund transfer network without communicating through a ticket validation network. More specifically:

Claim 1 recites "a processor configured to communicate over an electronic fund transfer network to a remote fund repository without communicating through a ticket validation network." (Emphasis added).

Claim 10 recites "an electronic fund transfer kiosk having a ticket printer and a second different processor that operates with the ticket printer, the second processor to communicate via the ticket validation network to the ticket validation system via an electronic transfer network to a remote fund repository without communicating through the ticket validation network." (Emphasis added).

Claim 21 recites "transmitting electronically a fund request from a processor of an electronic fund transfer kiosk to a remote fund repository via an electronic fund

transfer network without communicating through a ticket validation network.”
(Emphasis added).

Rowe and *Foodman*, alone or in combination, clearly do not teach or suggest a processor that communicates over an electronic fund transfer network to a remote fund repository without communicating through a ticket validation network as currently claimed.

The only portion of the Office Action that addresses this claim language states:

Rowe et al. teaches of a electronic fund transfer kiosk to provide a ticket that is used at a gaming device, wherein the kiosk comprises of a processor configured to communicate with a remote fund repository (col. 8: 1-11, wherein *Rowe et al.* allows user to insert a credit card/debt card, which needs to communicate with a fund repository in order to accept and provide player with monetary amount).

Column 8, lines 1-11 of *Rowe* states:

In one or more embodiments, the remote accounting/ticket generation systems 38 may comprise or include stand-alone voucher generation devices. In one embodiment, the remote accounting/ticket generation system 38 comprise a stand-alone device, such as a kiosk or workstation, which any user may access. In one embodiment, a player provides credit, such as with coin(s), currency or credit (such as with a credit card or bank debit card), and a voucher 24 is generated. The player may then utilize the voucher 24 at any gaming machine 22 which is adapted to accept a voucher.

The Examiner's statement does not address the claim language. Each independent claim recites some form of communication to a remote fund repository “without communicating through a ticket validation network.” The Office action addresses “communication with a remote fund repository,” but completely ignores “without communicating through a ticket validation network.”

In addition, *Rowe* does not teach the claim language cited above with reference to each independent claim. Each independent claim recites two different networks. More specially, claims 1 and 21 recite a “ticket validation network” and an “electronic

fund transfer network.” Similarly, claim 10 recites a “ticket validation network” and an “electronic transfer network.”

Rowe **only** teaches one network. The only mention of this network in Rowe appears in column 3, lines 20-28, which states:

[i]n accordance with the gaming system 20 of the invention, one or more gaming machines 22 capable of accepting (and in one or more embodiments, issuing, as described below) the vouchers 24 are associated with a central host 34. One or more appropriate communications links, whether wired or wireless, permit information to be transferred to and from each gaming machine 22 and the central host 34. The central host 34 may comprise a single computer or a group of computers associated with one another on a network.

In addition, this portion of Rowe clearly indicates that all communications travel over communications links of the same network to a central host. Thereby, teaching away from communication to a remote fund repository “without communicating through a ticket validation network.”

The teachings of *Foodman* do not cure the deficiencies of *Rowe*.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that each of the pending independent Claims, as well as each of the Claims that depend from those independent Claims, is patentably distinguished from *Rowe and Foodman* and in condition for allowance.

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance and in the absence of more pertinent art such action is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY



Adam H. Masia
Reg. No. 35,602
Customer No. 29159
(312) 807-4284

Dated: November 6, 2008